

to sever joined defendants after balancing the interest in judicial economy against the risk of prejudice to the defendant. *See, e.g., United States v. Olson*, 504 F.2d 1222, 1224 (9th Cir. 1974).

In order to protect a defendant's rights under the Confrontation Clause where a co-defendant's confession implicates another defendant at a joint trial, the Court should either sever the trial, exclude the co-defendant's statements, or redact the statements so as to eliminate any direct implication of the defendant. *See Bruton v. United States*, 391 U.S. 123 (1968). Because interests in economy and efficiency favor joint trials, *see U.S. v. Mayfield*, 189 F.3d 895, 899 (9th Cir. 1999), redacting a co-defendant's statements to sufficiently protect the implicated co-defendant's rights is generally preferred to severing the trial. *See Zafiro v. United States*, 506 U.S. 534, 539 (1993) ("[A] district court should grant severance under [Fed.R.Crim.P. 14] only if there is serious risk that a joint trial would prejudice a specific trial right of one of the defendants, or prevent the jury from making a reliable judgment about guilt or innocence.").

Redaction, however, is only a viable alternative to severance of the trial or exclusion of the statements where the statements can be redacted to avoid direct implication of the codefendant. *See United States v. Mitchell*, 502 F.3d 931, 965 (9th Cir. 2007) ("[T]he admission of a statement made by a non-testifying codefendant violates the Confrontation Clause when that statement facially, expressly, clearly, or powerfully implicates the defendant." (internal quotations omitted)). "[T]he substitution of a neutral pronoun or symbol in place of the defendant's name is not permissible if it is obvious that an alteration has occurred to protect the identity of a specific person." *United States v. Peterson*, 140 F.3d 819, 822 (9th Cir.1998).

Before ruling on a motion to sever, the Court "may order an attorney for the government to deliver to the court for in camera inspection any defendant's statement that the government intends to use as evidence." Fed.R.Crim.P. 14(b). Pursuant to Fed.R.Crim.P.14(b), Defendant asks the Court to order the United States to provide redacted copies of the statements *in camera* to the Court. Docket No. 178 at 5.

Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** the United States to provide, *in camera*, to the undersigned's chambers an unreadacted copy of each defendant's statement, as well as a redacted copy of each defendant's statement that it intends to use in evidence at trial on the instant matter. These statements shall be provided to chambers no later than July 13, 2016.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: July 8, 2016.

NANCY J. KOPPE United States Magistrate Judge